



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/086,287 | 02/28/2002 | David Wigley | 304122US8 | 2035 |
| 22850 7590 03/04/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | | |
| EXAMINER POPHAM, JEFFREY D | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2437 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 03/04/2009 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,287

Applicant(s)

WIGLEY ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY D. POPHAM

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Remarks

Claims 1-31 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/6/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/6/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Shannon teaches away from filtering being performed away from the network device. Applicant also states that "The invention defined by Claim 1 generally employs a collaborative filtering process, whereby filtering is performed at the subscriber network and at the remote network node." It is first noted that claim 1 is not directed to remote filtering, but rather performing further analysis at a remote node. Using the word "filtering" makes it sound like the remote node is performing such processing in real time (such as filtering the content while a user waits, before allowing the user access to such content), which neither Shannon nor the instant

application appear to do. Next, it is noted that Shannon provides for communication between the network device and remote devices such that period updates may be performed (this is seen, for example, in column 9, lines 25-43). Furthermore, Shannon discusses analysis being performed at such remote devices through use of network walkers and human analysis, for example, of newly found (uncategorized) URLs. Clearly Shannon is concerned with a remote entity analyzing new URLs and updating the local databases of network devices to include the categories for such URLs.

Applicant goes on to argue that "Any modification to change this to a decentralized filtering process would render Shannon unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of "[overcoming] problems of the prior art content filtering systems since in this invention, the content filtering can be centralized at the network device."" It is first noted that the citation provided from Shannon is with respect to the network or LAN itself, such that the network device will be a central entity that performs content filtering for the network, as opposed to each client performing content filtering. Kester works in the same manner as Shannon, providing for analysis and/or filtering at a centralized location on a network. Gusler also provides for analysis and/or filtering at a centralized location on a network.

Applicant also argues that the office action states that a person of ordinary skill in the art would modify Shannon to "efficiently categorize content at a central facility" and that "no support is provided for this subjective conclusion, and that this position is in contrast to the teachings of Shannon as noted above." However, the motivation for incorporating the content filter adaptation system of Kester into the content filtering and

access control system of Shannon was stated in the office action as being "in order to allow the system to efficiently categorize content at a central facility by providing uncategorized location indicators from subscriber networks, wherein the location indicators can be prioritized for faster results on content that is more frequently requested or believed to be part of a certain category, and to disseminate such information in a timely and efficient manner." These benefits are quite clear from the cited portions of Kester (e.g., column 7, line 17 to column 8, line 45), as well as other portions of the patent (such as column 6, lines 16-31, discussing prioritization of URLs). This is also quite clearly beneficial to the system of Shannon, wherein the network devices may upload uncategorized URLs for analysis by the remote device, without having to wait for a network-walker or human analyst to find the URL, thereby providing faster analysis and results in a timely and efficient manner.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification never refers to a medium, let alone a "computer readable storage medium encode with instructions". Paragraph 33 of the specification states that "Also stored on the Ethernet bridge 204 are instructions which implement the content analysis algorithms." There is no storage device discussed as being on this bridge however, so one cannot determine what this storage device would comprise. Furthermore, without discussion of any storage device or computer readable

storage medium in the specification, one cannot determine what the "computer readable storage medium" of claims 21-29 really is.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-21 and 30-31 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- The claims alternate between reference to "the subscriber network" and "the subscriber networks". Each of claims 1 and 11 provide for "at least one subscriber network" in the preamble. It is unclear, however, what the subscriber networks not discussed in most portions of the claims actually have to do with the system. Clarity is requested in this regard to keep the wording the same and refer to a single "subscriber network", "at least one subscriber network", or plural "subscriber networks" throughout the claims.
 - Claim 30 refers to "customizing a level of filtering performed at the network bridge based on policies adopted at the subscriber network." Claim 1 does not refer to any filtering or level of filtering, nor does claim 1 refer to any policy adopted at a subscriber network. It is unclear how claim 30 is supposed to fit into the method of claim 1, as the limitation of claim 30 appears entirely independent of the method discussed in claim 1.
 - Claim 31 refers to "an exception list that includes a list of digital information allowed to be accessed". This limitation does not appear to have basis in the application as originally filed. The application discusses an exception list including URLs or the like, but not the actual digital information. Furthermore,

- claim 31 discusses "bypassing a filtering process of steps (b) through (f). As discussed in the application as originally filed, steps (b) through (f) are not all part of a filtering process, but only a portion of these steps are. It is unclear whether claim 31 means to bypass only a filtering process portion of those steps or bypass all of steps (b) through (f).
- Claim 31 is also objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 31 refers to bypassing steps (b) through (f) of claim 1 if a location indicator is found in an exception list. When this occurs, steps (b) through (f) of claim 1 are not performed, thereby removing steps from claim 1. Therefore, claim 31 attempts to modify claim 1 by removing steps that are performed by claim 1, as opposed to further limiting the claim and is, therefore, in improper dependent form.
 - Claim 21 recites "A computer readable storage medium encode with instructions". Furthermore, claim 21 refers to "the network users" in the preamble before any network users are introduced. For purposes of prior art rejection, "encode" has been interpreted as "encoded" and "the network users" has been interpreted as "network users".
- Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As discussed above, the specification never refers to any "computer readable storage medium encode with instructions." Without a definition of such within the application, one cannot determine what, precisely, this computer readable storage medium comprises. Therefore, one may interpret this computer readable storage medium as being a transmission medium, thereby making claims 21-29 non-statutory as being directed purely to software.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon (U.S. Patent 6,233,618) in view of Kester (U.S. Patent 7,194,464) and Gusler (U.S. Patent 6,917,980).

Regarding Claim 1,

Shannon discloses a computer based method for restricting access to network accessible digital information by network users of at least one subscriber network, the method comprising the steps of:

Monitoring at a subscriber network requests by the network users for digital information (Column 12, lines 37-52);

Determining whether a location indicator associated with a request is included in a database of restricted location indicators maintained at the subscriber network and denying the request where the location indicator is in the database (Column 14, lines 16-41; the database of restricted location indicators being the restricted destination database);

Retrieving at the subscriber network digital information stored at a location corresponding to the location indicator and initially analyzing content of information at the location in the event that the location indicator is not in the database and denying or fulfilling the request based on the initial analysis (Column 14, line 49 to Column 15, line 4), wherein searching of the database and the initial content analysis occur at a network bridge at the subscriber network (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3);

But does not explicitly disclose periodically forwarding the location indicators not in the database from the subscriber network to a remote node or that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time.

Kester, however, discloses periodically forwarding location indicators associated with requests and not in the database from the subscriber network to a remote network node (Column 6, lines 16-32);

Retrieving at the remote network node information stored at a location corresponding to the forwarded location indicator and further analyzing a content type of the retrieved information (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45); and

Periodically dispatching to the at least one subscriber network from the remote node location indicators found by the further analysis to have restricted type content stored therein, for inclusion in the database of restricted location indicators maintained at the subscriber network (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content filter adaptation system of Kester into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon in order to allow the system to efficiently categorize content at a central facility by providing uncategorized location indicators from subscriber networks, wherein the location indicators can be prioritized for faster results on content that is more frequently requested or believed to be part of a certain category, and to disseminate such information in a timely and efficient manner.

Gusler, however, discloses that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time (Abstract; Column 5, line 63 to Column 6,

line 33; and Column 7, lines 10-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the dynamic filtering system of Gusler into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester in order to allow the system to provide dynamic and intelligent analysis of content from each source, as opposed to a decision based on a single document, thereby providing a more complete analysis of what content is allowed from what sources.

Regarding Claim 11,

Claim 11 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the digital information includes content accessible via the Internet (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 12,

Claim 12 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 3,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the subscriber networks are

LANs wherein client computer communicate via the Ethernet access protocol (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 4,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 3, in addition, Shannon discloses that the network bridge is an Ethernet bridge (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is a URL (Column 8, lines 24-34).

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is

extracted from an Ethernet frame originating from a client computer of a network user (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 16,

Claim 16 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 8,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses determining whether the location indicator is in an exception list before determining whether it is in the database and fulfilling the request in the event that the location indicator is in the exception list (Column 13, line 52 to Column 14, line 15).

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 9,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the request is fulfilled in the event that the location indicator is in the database but is a permitted category of restricted content (Column 14, lines 16-25).

Regarding Claim 19,

Claim 19 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 21,

Shannon discloses a computer readable storage medium encoded with instructions which when executed by a computer, cause the computer to execute a method for restricting access to network accessible digital information by network users of a subscriber network, the method comprising:

Monitoring requests by the network users for digital information wherein the subscriber network includes respective client computers for the network users (Column 12, lines 16-52);

Determining whether a location indicator associated with a request is included in a database of restricted location indicators stored at the subscriber network, wherein the location indicator is extracted from a data frame originating from the network user request (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3; and Column 15, lines 16-41);

Analyzing a content type of information stored at a location corresponding to a location indicator not in the database, and denying or fulfilling the request based on the analysis, wherein location indicators are extracted and content analyzed by a network bridge installed at the subscriber network (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3; and Column 14, line 49 to Column 15, line 4);

But does not explicitly disclose periodically forwarding the location indicators not in the database from the subscriber network to a remote

node or that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time.

Kester, however, discloses Periodically forwarding location indicators associated with requests and not in the database to a remote network node (Column 6, lines 16-32);

Allowing the remote network node to retrieve the digital information stored at a location corresponding to the forwarded location indicator for further analysis of a content type of the retrieved information (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45); and

Computer readable program code for periodically receiving from the remote network node location indicators found by the further analysis to have restricted type content stored therein, and including the received location indicators in the database (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content filter adaptation system of Kester into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon in order to allow the system to efficiently categorize content at a central facility by providing uncategorized location indicators from subscriber networks, wherein the location indicators can be prioritized for faster results on content that is more frequently requested or believed to be part of a certain category, and to disseminate such information in a timely and efficient manner.

Gusler, however, discloses that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time (Abstract; Column 5, line 63 to Column 6, line 33; and Column 7, lines 10-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the dynamic filtering system of Gusler into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester in order to allow the system to provide dynamic and intelligent analysis of content from each source, as opposed to a decision based on a single document, thereby providing a more complete analysis of what content is allowed from what sources.

Regarding Claim 22,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 21, in addition, Shannon discloses that the digital information is content accessible via the Internet (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 23,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 22, in addition, Shannon discloses that the subscriber network is a LAN wherein the client computers communicate via the Ethernet protocol (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 24,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 22, in addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is a URL (Column 8, lines 24-34).

Regarding Claim 25,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 23, in addition, Shannon discloses that the data frame is an Ethernet frame originating from a client computer of a requesting network user (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 27,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 21, in addition, Shannon discloses determining whether the location indicator is in an exception list before determining whether it is in the database and for fulfilling the request in the event that the location indicator is in the exception list (Column 13, line 52 to Column 14, line 15).

Regarding Claim 28,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 21, in addition, Shannon discloses fulfilling a request in the event that the location indicator is in the database but is a permitted category of restricted content (Column 14, lines 16-25).

Regarding Claim 30,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses (g) accessing the network bridge and customizing a level of filtering performed at the network bridge based on policies adopted at the subscriber network (Column 6, lines 16-27; Column 8, lines 12-23; and Column 11, line 64 to Column 12, line 15).

Regarding Claim 31,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses, prior to steps (b) through (f), further comprising comparing the location indicator to an exception list that includes a list of digital information allowed to be accessed by the network users of the at least one subscriber network; and bypassing a filtering process of steps (b) through (f) if the location is included in the exception list and proceeding to steps (b) through (f) if the location indicator is not included in the exception list (Column 6, lines 28-60; Column 7, line 58 to Column 8, line 11; and Column 13, line 52 to Column 14, line 15); and Gusler discloses, prior to steps (b) through (f), further comprising comparing the location indicator to an exception list that includes a list of digital information allowed to be accessed by the network users of the at least one subscriber network; and bypassing a filtering process of steps (b) through (f) if the location is included in the exception list and proceeding to steps (b) through (f) if the location indicator is not included in the exception list (Column 6, line 47 to Column 7, line 51).

7. Claims 7, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon in view of Kester and Gusler, further in view of Maurer (Maurer et al., "Hash Table Methods", 1975, pp. 5-19).

Regarding Claim 7,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose that the database is stored in encrypted form and is searched for an encrypted location indicator.

Maurer, however, discloses that the database is stored in encrypted form and is searched for an encrypted location indicator (Pages 5-7, Introduction). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hash table of Maurer into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to provide a faster method of storing and searching for a specified URL within an organized database of hashes.

Regarding Claim 17,

Claim 17 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 26,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose encrypting the location indicator before including it in the database or determining whether the encrypted location indicator is in the database.

Maurer, however, discloses encrypting the location indicator before including it in the database or determining whether the encrypted location indicator is in the database (Pages 5-7, Introduction). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hash table of Maurer into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to provide a faster method of storing and searching for a specified URL within an organized database of hashes.

8. Claims 10, 20, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon in view of Kester and Gusler, further in view of Willens (U.S. Patent 5,889,958).

Regarding Claim 10,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis.

Willens, however, discloses that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis (Column 4, lines 26-45; and Column 5, lines 38-46). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the remote access control system of Willens into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to keep the databases more up to date, thereby providing better filtering and/or to allow the system to be run on a client that does not have a hard drive (dedicated Internet terminal).

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 29,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis.

Willens, however, discloses that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis (Column 4, lines 26-45; and Column 5, lines 38-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the remote access control system of Willens into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to keep the databases more up to date, thereby providing better filtering and/or to allow the system to be run on a client that does not have a hard drive (dedicated Internet terminal).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY D. POPHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2437

/Jeffrey D Popham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

Application/Control Number: 10/086,287

Page 22

Art Unit: 2437

/Minh Dieu Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2437